DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 549 SO 024 843

AUTHOR Wessels, Michael G.
TITLE The Role of Peace Education in a Culture of Peace: A Social-Psychological Analysis. Peace Education Miniprints No. 65.
INSTITUTION School of Education, Malmo (Sweden).
REPORT NO ISSN-1101-641B
PUB DATE Oct 94
NOTE 20p.
AVAILABLE FROM R&D Group, School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmo, Sweden.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; Cultural Interrelationships; Decision Making; Foreign Countries; *Futures (of Society); *Global Education; Human Relations; Interpersonal Communication; *Peace; Problem Solving; *Prosocial Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes the role of peace education in the creation of a culture of peace from the standpoint of social psychology. To meet the current challenges to peace, it is necessary to develop programs of research, education, and intervention that are as systemic and multidimensional as violence itself. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) nascent culture of peace program offers promise in this regard. UNESCO's program is an integrated approach to peace building and post-conflict reconstruction. Peace education programs that support a culture of peace should embody these five major principles: (1) to produce systemic change, peace education must be integrated across a variety of social levels; (2) cooperative orientations are essential components of the psychological substrate for a culture of peace; (3) cooperation on superordinate goals shared by groups and individuals in conflict provides one of the best means of reducing and preventing destructive conflict; (4) empathy and multicultural understanding must be integrated into programs of peace education; and (5) there must be a thorough reorientation of the structure, content, and pedagogy of peace education toward positive peace. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 384 549

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. BJERSTEDT

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE ROLE OF PEACE EDUCATION IN A CULTURE OF PEACE: A SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Michael G. Wessells

To meet the current challenges to peace, it is necessary to develop programs of research, education, and intervention that are as systemic and multidimensional as violence itself. UNESCO's nascent culture of peace program is promising in this regard. The purpose of this paper is to analyze from the standpoint of social psychology the role of peace education in the creation of a culture of peace.

THE ROLE OF PEACE EDUCATION IN A CULTURE OF PEACE: A SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Michael G. Wessells
Dept. of Psychology
Randolph-Macon College
Ashland, VA 23005

Although the end of the Cold War lifted hopes for peace, the post-Cold War era has turned out to be far from peaceful. Despite the inspiring developments toward peace in the Middle East and in South Africa, the world faces a deadly mixture of nationalism, ethnic violence, racism, nuclear proliferation, and environmental destruction (Brown & Schraub, 1992; Montville, 1991; Sivard, 1991, 1993; Wessells, in press).

If the Cold War was a time of profound inter-state violence and East-West tensions, this is a time of profound intra-state violence and unrest. At present, there are no major inter-state wars occurring, yet many bitter intra-state and intercommunal conflicts are underway, and their bloody character is indicated poignantly by the massacres in Rwanda and the ethnic cleansing and mass rapes in former Yugoslavia. Throughout the world, many societies are gripped by structural violence in the form of institutionalized oppression, human rights abuses, and widespread poverty and hunger. Militarism, which is both a symptom and an amplifier of deeply rooted social injustices, continues to spread throughout the developing world.

In the post-Cold War era, it is increasingly apparent that violence is systemic, that is, institutionalized and embedded in widely held norms, practices, and ways of life. The systemic nature of violence is readily apparent in the "combat zones" within many major U.S. cities such as Chicago and New York. In these areas, youths are socialized into life in the streets where gangs

prevail, where impoverished, broken families provide little structure and guidance, where crime and drugs are ubiquitous, and where homicide is the leading cause of death for African-American men under the age of twenty-five years (Richters & Martinez, 1993). The schools in these areas are woefully inadequate and very dangerous, as nearly a quarter of a million students carry guns daily. As indicated by the Rodney King hearing and the subsequent L.A. riots, racism and discrimination continue to flourish. These processes, like other forms of structural violence and social injustice, continue to fuel violence, to damage lives, and to thwart the development of peace, which requires the establishment of social justice.

The correction and prevention of systemic violence poses significant challenges, not the least of which is the psychological problem of fragmented thinking. During the Cold War, it became rather habitual for the public to focus on international violence. The emphasis on the East-West conflict marginalized issues of social justice, structural violence, and sustainable development, particularly in the developing world where nations were treated as pawns in the superpower struggle. Within the superpower nations, external enmity provided a convenient rationalization for one's own injustices and a diversion from problems associated with militarism and structural violence. This Cold War mindset served the interests of the dominant decision-making elites within the superpowers.

This international focus and compartmentalized thinking also permeated peace studies and peace education, which was overwhelmingly concerned with negative peace and the prevention of nuclear war (Lopez, 1994). Although this focus was valuable, it created an unfortunate fragmentation of thinking that has been difficult to break. In the 1980s in the U.S., for example, university courses on nuclear war often failed to make the broader connections between war and social injustice, human rights issues, and ecological degradation. Even today, there is a continuing struggle to integrate the analysis of these issues fully into programs of peace research and education and to connect them fully with issues of international violence and war (Lopez, 1994).

To meet the current challenges to peace, it is necessary to develop programs of research, education, and intervention that are as systemic and multidimensional as violence itself. UNESCO's nascent culture of peace program is promising in this regard. The purpose of this paper is to analyze from the standpoint of social psychology the role of peace education in the creation of a culture of peace.

What Is a Culture of Peace?

UNESCO's culture of peace program is an integrated approach to peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction. Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, stated that a culture of peace policy entails "a radical re-casting of the peace-building mechanisms through which the Organization operates" (cited in Williams, 1993). As suggested by innovative pilot programs underway in El Salvador and Mozambique, this emerging program interconnects multi-level conflict resolution efforts with culturally sensitive, participatory models that link development, human rights, and democratization. At the heart of the program is the view that cooperation across many different levels of society and in diverse enterprises – business, education, health care, the arts, and security protection, among others – is essential for healing the wounds of war, for preventing destructive conflict in the future, and for promoting sustainable development.

Aside from this general description, it would be premature to define "culture of peace" in a precise manner since the program is in its formative stages. Furthermore, it would be culturally insensitive to prescribe an exact meaning of "culture of peace." Different societies may construct the concept and pursue diverse methods of implementing it. The act of cultural construction of the meaning of "culture of peace" is itself an essential part of building peace, and peace must surely reflect diverse values, assumptions, and world views. Rather than being rigidly prescriptive, "culture of peace" is an evocative phrase that invites dialogue and partnership in the construction of its meaning.

Despite these caveats, there are a number of basic assumptions and common elements that help to clarify what a culture of peace is. Since a culture is a system of interlocking social levels, it follows that a culture of peace entails the integration of peace across diverse levels – families, communities, ethnic and religious groups, etc. It is also assumed that peace cannot be equated with passivity and absence of conflict. Conflict is not only an essential feature of all social systems, it also has beneficial effects on social change, interpersonal relationships, and problem-solving (Deutsch, 1973). A culture of peace should be viewed not as a conflict-free utopia but as a culture in which individuals, groups, and nations have productive, cooperative relations with one another and manage their inevitable conflicts constructively.

Woven into the fabric of a culture of peace are democratic values, social justice, respect for human rights, sensitivity to cultural differences, values and practices conducive to nonviolent conflict resolution, and social structures and

processes that support equitable, sustainable development and the satisfaction of basic human needs for food, clothing, shelter, identity, and security (cf. "Action Programme to Promote a Culture of Peace"). A culture of peace will incorporate elements of both positive and negative peace (Galtung, 1969). In the broadest sense, a culture of peace is one in which there are caring and just relations among individuals, groups, and nations based on full realization of their positive interdependence with one another and with their environment.

Defining fully and building a culture of peace will require the insights and tools of all disciplines, and psychology is only one element in a large and complex cultural mosaic. Nevertheless, the psychological dimensions are important since a culture of peace must include integrated patterns of thought, feeling, behavior, and social relations that nourish nonviolence and individual, social, and ecological health. The following section examines from the standpoint of social psychology the role of peace education in building a culture of peace.

Peace Education for a Culture of Peace

Cultures of violence are supported by a psychological infrastructure of individual beliefs and social norms and values that emphasize violence as a means of achieving power, protection, wealth, prestige, self and group esteem, and social dominance. Typically, power is seen in zero-sum terms, with little appreciation of the power associated with positive interdependence (Boulding, 1989). In inner city combat zones in developed nations children are socialized into systems of discrimination, hatred, and violence. These systems involve the cultural construction and shaping of social behavior, values, and attitudes in the home, in schools, in the community, and in the larger public arena (Garbarino, Kostelny & Dubrow, 1991). Similar systems are at work in regions torn by political violence, where children are socialized for hate, where identity is often forged by opposition to the inimical "Other," where communities have been unravelled and many families have been traumatized, and where ideology, role models, and peer pressures draw youths into lives as warriors, thereby continuing the cycles of violence.

To create a culture of peace, an essential project is to reorient the learning and socialization processes that support the psychological infrastructure of violence. Whereas hatred, violence, and oppression are transmitted across generations in cultures of violence, a culture of peace must cultivate cooperation and interdependence; values of equality, diversity, social justice, and

ecological health; norms, beliefs, and attitudes that support nonviolent conflict resolution and reconciliation; and processes of active engagement and spiritual fulfillment conducive to positive social change.

Peace education, broadly defined, is the cornerstone of a culture of peace. Education is a means of passing on to future generations the shared knowledge, values, myths, practices, norms, and beliefs that define a culture. Without education for peace, there could be no continuing culture of peace. To establish the foundation for peace, societies must cultivate learning experiences that promote peace-oriented values, practices, norms, and beliefs. Furthermore, education is a primary vehicle for socialization for social change, and it is unlikely that change on any large cultural scale could occur without a transformation of educational goals, institutions, and practices. To create a culture of peace, it is essential to socialize youths, families, and communities in ways that promote nonviolent conflict resolution, sustainability, and social justice.

The past several decades has witnessed significant growth and progress in the field of peace education (Bjerstedt, 1993). Yet many peace education programs were created with a Cold War frame, and many peace education efforts focused primarily on schools. To serve a culture of peace, peace education must be reoriented and intensified in ways that enable the reconstruction of the social order and the creation of peace. Although the design, content, and pedagogy of peace education will vary according to the context, peace education programs that support a culture of peace should embody five major principles. These principles are outlined below, together with broad implementation suggestions in the spirit of stimulating dialogue about how to achieve a culture of peace.

1. To produce systemic change, peace education must be integrated across a variety of social levels.

Although the term "education" is often equated with activities and developments in schools, very significant learning occurs outside of classrooms, beyond the walls of educational institutions. In the family, many children learn to hate, to see violence as an acceptable means of handling conflict, to accept societal patterns of gender oppression and environmental destruction, and to hold individual, competitive, materialistic values. In the streets, many children learn that they must be tough or be preyed upon, and gangs and peers teach them patterns of violence, crime, and drug abuse. In situations of political violence, youths may learn to embrace ideologies that insure the perpetuation of armed conflict. In the workplace, education continues, as

youths and adults adapt to contexts permeated by racism, gender oppression, power asymmetry, economic inequity, and environmental insensitivity.

To establish a culture of peace, education for peace must occur on a continuing basis throughout a diversity of cultural subsystems. Peace education implemented in one social context is valuable, but it is important to recognize that the prosocial learning that takes place in one arena may be offset by the negative learning that occurs in another arena. For example, school-based programs on nonviolent conflict resolution may have limited impact if after school, youths must function in streets where violence prevails. In a culture of peace, peace education could not be a stand-alone project, one subject of many offered in the schools. Rather, it must include work across diverse levels, from the family to the community, and it must be organic, integrating across levels in ways that are mutually supportive of peace. Peace education must be integrated into families, communities, and the workplace, and it must be consciously constructed in the wider arena where social, economic, and political changes occur.

Community learning centers offer a useful means of bridging education across different levels. For example, a center that by day served as a school might be used in evenings and on weekends for educational workshops on nonviolent parenting or nonviolent conflict resolution in families, for job training and adult literacy programs, or for environmental cleanup or peer mediation programs in the community. Whereas traditional school systems work to maintain separation from community affairs, community learning centers would serve as hubs of community-school interaction, where parents come to teach and learn with their children, where volunteer activities in the community would be integrated into the learning experience, and where community dialogues would identify and guide educational programs to meet emerging community needs.

2. Cooperative orientations are essential components of the psychological substrate for a culture of peace.

Many educational institutions have traditionally emphasized competition, partly out of the desire to nurture excellence. Particularly in individualistic contexts, excessive emphasis on competition encourages a win-lose orientation to conflict and a strong motivation to win, whether in athletics, in classroom competitions, or in informal rivalries with one's siblings and peers. Intense competition often fuels destructive conflict, particularly if social norms support retaliation or offer few restraints on escalation and damaging activities such as fighting and name-calling. In schools racked by ethnic con-

flicts, competition for status encourages each group to assert itself over the other, creating damaging conflict spirals that escalate into destructive conflict.

The establishment of a culture of peace requires a transformation of motivational orientations toward conflict from the competitive to the cooperative. In a cooperative orientation, there is a sense of positive interdependence, of commonality of interests, and of concern over the welfare of the other as well as oneself. Cooperative orientations support constructive conflict management and resolution by encouraging win-win attitudes, positive affect, and effective communication, problem-solving, and negotiating behavior (Deutsch, 1973, 1994). On the other hand, competitive, win-lose orientations toward conflict encourage mutual hostility, rigidity, suspicion, negative stereotyping, excessive reliance on threats and coercion, problems of communication and negotiation, and attempts to overpower the adversary. Held widely by individuals and groups, particularly in social contexts marked by large asymmetries of power, competitive orientations to conflict provide a psychological infrastructure for destructive conflict and a culture of violence. The encouragement of cooperative orientations to conflict not only enables particular cooperative projects but also transforms the ways in which people view and respond to conflict on a continuing basis. By laying the foundation for the long-term processes of social reconstruction, conflict prevention, and peacebuilding, cooperative orientations help to build the psychological foundation for a culture of peace.

Establishing a cooperative orientation must begin in the family, where sibling rivalry provides one of the earliest channels into destructive competition. Family programs on cooperation and on parenting for peace would be valuable. In schools, in communities, and in workplaces, it will also be valuable to have programs built around cooperation, thereby allowing people to learn cooperation by actually participating in it. In a culture of peace, people will construct peace by actually practicing peace through cooperation.

3. Cooperation on superordinate goals shared by groups and individuals in conflict provides one of the best means of reducing and preventing destructive conflict.

In many communities, cooperative peace education seems unrealistic because there is a powerful history of damaged relations, hostility, and negative behavior by groups in conflict. Well intentioned attempts to bring members of hostile, competing groups together for peaceful relations in a school context (as was done in the U.S. through desegregation of the public schools) often results in name-calling, fights, and increased tensions between groups. To be

effective, peace education must come to grips with this problem. Because this same dynamic applies in communities and in the workplace, there is a need for means of reducing intergroup hostility and for creating situations conducive to cooperation and peace.

One of the essential tools for resolving conflict constructively and for building positive social relations is through cooperation on superordinate goals shared by groups in conflict. Cooperation on shared goals establishes a commonality of interests and a sense of positive interdependence between competing groups, strengthening the view that it is in everyone's interest to work together (Blake & Mouton, 1979; Cook, 1984; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Sherif et al., 1961; Worchel, 1986). Furthermore, cooperation often serves to break down distinctions between "us" and "them", to weaken powerful enemy images of the other as diabolical and untrustworthy, and to encourage positive communication and problem-solving (Sherif et al., 1961). In contrast to contrived cooperation that seems the "nice" thing to do, cooperation on superordinate goals is in the interest of each group, which cannot achieve its goals without cooperation.

Fortunately, the real world offers many examples of situations in which groups must work together to accomplish their goals. Competing groups in a U.S. community may both want to reduce the rate of violent crime and may realize that neither can do so without the assistance of the other. Israelis and Palestinians may see that without cooperation, precious water resources will decline, precipitating fighting that is in neither group's interest; neighboring nations may appreciate the value of cooperating on halting nuclear proliferation, knowing that only joint efforts can limit proliferation, etc. In classrooms, cooperation on superordinate goals is the basis for programs of cooperative learning, in which individuals are interdependent and must work together to complete a project or assignment (Johnson, Johnson & Holubec, 1986; Johnson & Johnson, 1989).

In several respects, cooperation on superordinate goals is an essential part of building a culture of peace. In addition to reconciling groups locked in destructive conflict, this method has great potential for the prevention of destructive conflict. When competing groups recognize their interdependence, it is less likely that they will work to hurt the other group and more likely that they will make efforts to sustain each other. In addition, the creation of cooperative orientations would be limited if situational factors consistently mitigated against cooperation. For cooperation to occur on a sustained basis, potentially competing individuals and groups must see that there is more to be gained through cooperation than through rivalry and attempts to defeat the

opponent. On a societal level, it is unlikely that problems such as poverty and ecological damage will be corrected through anything short of collaborative efforts. For these reasons, cooperation on superordinate goals is an integral part of a culture of peace and of efforts to construct it.

This insight has immediate and powerful applications – peace education programs should foster cooperation between competing groups. If the community is besieged by strong racial tensions, then there need to be cooperative educational programs that promote cooperation, prosocial behavior, and interdependence between the conflicting groups. If, for example, a school had significant populations of African-American and Caucasian students who often fought with and derogated each other, it would be appropriate to develop joint projects that require cooperation and that are of keen interest to each group. To address the racial tensions in the larger community, the community learning centers discussed earlier could serve as a home for cooperative community-improvement projects that cross racial boundaries. In the workplace, too, there would be multiracial programs involving cooperation on shared goals. In this manner, peace education would extend beyond the walls of the school and build the sense of positive interdependence into the community and the workplace.

For purposes of post-conflict reconstruction, cooperative peace education would also play a key role. Even after the cessation of fighting, lingering hostilities and festering psychological wounds create the conditions for future destructive conflict. Healing these wounds is best achieved through cooperation across the lines of the conflict. The desire of the groups in conflict to provide a sound education for their children offers important opportunities for cooperative learning that could heal the wounds of war. For example, if the groups had fought over scarce resources, it could be productive to create cooperative learning projects aimed at creating new ways of preserving scarce resources. Or if children on both sides had suffered psychological and physical wounds, there could be cooperative learning projects involving communities, psychologists, and physicians to discover more effective ways of healing these wounds. This cooperative learning approach embodies the view that learning peace is largely a matter of learning by doing.

4. Empathy and multicultural understanding must be integrated into programs of peace education.

Many intercommunal and international conflicts are rooted in deep ethnic, religious, historical, and cultural divisions and associated patterns of oppression, mutual derogation, and cultural insensitivity (Staub, 1989). In

general, groups and nations locked in heated conflict often harbor negative stereotypes and diabolical enemy images of the other. These stereotypes and images heighten fears of the adversary, encourage a monolithic view of the adversary that overlooks its internal diversity and its positive qualities, negatively bias perceptions of the adversay's motives, promote rigid and simplistic thinking, and socially isolate the conflicting parties, thereby impeding communication and negotiation (Bjerstedt, 1989; Silverstein, 1989, 1992; Wahlstrom, 1987; White, 1984). In extreme form, dehumanized images and stereotypes divide the social world into the "Good Us" and the "Evil Them", making it very difficult to see common interests, to recognize positive interdependence, or to view cooperation as anything more than a moral salve or as a means of perpetuating an unjust status quo. Even in the absence of strong enemy images, ethnocentrism and egocentric thinking often combine with norms of ignorance and social isolation to thwart empathy, constructive conflict management, and relationship building.

Realistic empathy is needed to humanize the adversary, to create a more complex, differentiated view of the diversity and multiple constituencies that exist on the other side, to enable each party to the conflict to understand how the other parties view the conflict and the key issues and interests at stake, to clarify the adversary's motivations, and to set the stage for cooperative problem-solving. Particularly in very heated conflicts in which the parties are unwilling to talk, much less to cooperate, empathy is a prerequisite for making progress. In addition, empathy is an essential process for building cultural sensitivity and helping the parties to communicate in constructive ways.

Empathy processes must be grounded in a careful analysis of the history, values, beliefs, perceptions, symbols, and practices of particular groups. If the depth, richness, and the value of other cultural groups is not appreciated, efforts toward empathy may lapse into superficiality and paternalism, or they may be pursued in the spirit of "know thy enemy". Thus skills of empathy should be developed in the context of program for teaching about the value and strength of diversity, about the culture of different groups, and about the meaning and value of peace.

A useful tool for developing empathy is the interactive problem-solving workshop pioneered by John Burton and extended and refined by Herbert Kelman (1992). Kelman's work on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict involves bringing together small groups of carefully selected Israelis and Palestinians for dialogue under the facilitation of a trusted third party. The heart of the experience is analytic, problem-solving discussion in which each group

articulates its views of the issues, its historic experience, and its perceptions. The facilitator works to help members of each group understand clearly not only the views of the other group but also why they hold them. Since the participants are influential in their respective communities, they are in a position to infuse their new learning into the political process. Although it is difficult to quantify the results of this process, it seems clear that Kelman's work has improved communication, reduced negative stereotyping, and increased willingness to meet and to negotiate on both sides. Indeed, half the Palestinians who took part in the peace talks begun in Madrid had been involved in Kelman's workshops (Kelman, personal communication).

In developing comprehensive peace education programs, it is useful to think in terms of a multi-component process in which steps to encourage empathy precede and accompany on a continuing basis efforts to build cooperative activities and orientations. For example, conflict prevention efforts in war-torn areas should employ problem-solving dialogues as a means of improving communication, increasing mutual understanding, and promoting the development of nonviolent means of handling problems that could spark a renewal of hostilities. Such dialogues are crucial for making the transition from peace-keeping to peacemaking and peacebuilding. Since religious differences permeate many intercommunal conflicts, it would be particularly valuable to have dialogues across lines of conflicting religious groups or spiritual communities. Similarly, in schools and communities where racial tensions are high, it would be helpful to hold interactive problem-solving workshops involving members of the groups in conflict as a means of identifying superordinate goals which could then serve as a basis for cooperation. Community learning centers could serve as a place for intergenerational, multiethnic dialogues that advance multicultural learning and enable systematic efforts toward nonviolent conflict resolution.

5. *There must be a thorough reorientation of the structure, content, and pedagogy of peace education toward positive peace.*

Too often, educational institutions embody inequities in the larger society. Structurally, they serve the interests of the prevailing social order, which is male-dominated, not oriented toward correcting social injustice and environmental devastation, tacitly supportive of inequities and violence as a means of handling conflict, and compartmentalized in its approach. In the U.S., for example, too few people of color hold positions of power in the educational system, and the white exodus from inner cities has created a de facto system of school segregation. The majority of teachers are underpaid

women, whose supervisors are predominantly men, who have not dealt vigorously with problems of gender inequity in schools. School programs are created and implemented apart from community development and work-related programs, and the funding for each of these is quite independent.

In structure as well as in spirit, peace education must be a microcosm of the values it seeks to nourish in the world. To advance toward a culture of peace, peace education must work to correct these structural problems by making thoughtful linkages between schools, families, communities, and the workplace, by bringing women and members of minority groups into positions of influence, by creating a welcoming environment for people of diverse orientations and backgrounds, and making social equity a central feature of education. At every level, connections must be made between learning, development, and culture.

With regard to content, peace education should expand its focus from the prevention of war to the construction of positive peace (Bandarage, 1994; Brock-Utne, 1990; Klare, 1994; Lopez, 1994; Reardon, 1990; Tickner, 1994). There should be a thorough integration of feminist perspectives, analyses of destructive "-isms" such as racism and sexism, efforts to clarify the connections between peace and sustainable development, and a systematic examination of economic and social inequality. Although they are often treated separately, development education, international studies, and environmental education should be thoroughly integrated with peace education. Careful study of diverse cultures should begin at an early age and continue throughout adulthood. The subject of culture of peace should itself be a major topic, inviting ongoing dialogue and reflection about the nature and goals of peace education and its role in reconstructing societies. In a culture of peace, peace education must be as broad, integrated and inclusive as possible.

To build a culture of peace, the pedagogy of peace education should be broad, diverse, and oriented towards life-long learning and critical thinking. Skills of active listening, problem solving and conflict resolution should be developed early on, and nurtured continually. Following models employed productively in a number of U.S. cities, peer mediation programs should be employed in schools and used more frequently than administrative interventions as means of handling conflict (Deutsch, 1994). Similarly, mediation programs should be developed for families, communities, and places of work, building nonviolent conflict resolution into the fabric of life. Education should be approached as a learner-centered task in which beginning students, more advanced students, and teachers collaborate and in which competitive tasks are replaced by cooperative learning. At every level, personal experi-

ence should be honored and treated as a base for dialogue and new learning, and emotional and social elements of learning should be included in the educational process. Through community learning centers, peace education should continue beyond school walls and outside of formal educational channels. In all venues, constructive critical thinking and dialogue should be nurtured, as peace education should never become a prescriptive tool for enforcing one particular set of political views.

Conclusion

Cultures are never constructed according to precise blueprints - they evolve through practice grounded in historic traditions and in the values, norms, myths, and institutions that are continuously being constructed by people in response to changing needs and circumstances. The same principle applies to a culture of peace. Ultimately, the creation of a culture of peace is a process of learning by doing.

Education, too, is a process of construction and a form of learning by doing on a broad, societal scale. Of all the forms of learning by doing, none is of greater significance for lasting peace than education. It is through education that the minds and souls of future generations develop. Education is vital in creating the psychological and social infrastructure of a culture of peace.

A central task in constructing a culture of peace is the establishment of an integrated, inclusive system of peace education that embodies values of peace, social justice, equality, and ecological harmony. Peace education must be expanded to include families, schools, communities, religious centers, and places of employment, and key connections must be made between culture, development, human rights, democratization, social equity, and sustainability. At every level, the beliefs, values, and methods inherent in the nonviolent resolution of conflict must be cultivated and put into practice.

What is proposed here is nothing less than a far-reaching transformation of education in general and peace education in particular. In a very real sense, this transformation is a process of cultural construction – a form of learning by doing – that is a key part of the process of building a culture of peace.

References

Action programme to promote a culture of peace. UNESCO Executive Board Document (27 C/126), 1993.

Bandarage, A. Global peace and security in the post-Cold War Era: A "Third World" perspective. In: Klare, M.T. (Ed.) *Peace & world security studies: A curriculum guide*. (6th ed.) Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994. Pp. 29-42.

Bjerstedt, Å. Explorations of enemy images using an associative technique. *Educational and Psychological Interactions* (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 95, 1989.

Bjerstedt, Å. (Ed.) *Peace education: Global perspectives*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1993.

Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. Intergroup problem solving in organizations: From theory to practice. In: Worchel, S. & Austin, W.G. (Eds.) *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979.

Boulding, K. *Three faces of power*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989.

Brock-Utne, B. Feminist perspectives on peace. In: Smoker, P., Davies, R. & Munske, B. (Eds.) *A reader in peace studies*. New York: Pergamon, 1990. Pp. 144-150.

Brown, S.J. & Schraub, K.M. (Eds.) *Resolving Third World conflict: Challenges for a new era*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1992.

Cook, S.W. Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In: Miller, N. & Brewer, M. (Eds.) *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation*. New York: Academic Press, 1984. Pp. 155-185.

Deutsch, M. *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1973.

Deutsch, M. Educating for a peaceful world. *American Psychologist*, 1993, *48*, 510-517.

Deutsch, M. Constructive conflict resolution: Principles, training, and research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1994, *50*, 13-32.

Galtung, J. Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 1969, *6*, 167-191.

Garbarino, J., Kostelny, K. & Dubrow, N. *No place to be child: Growing up in a war zone*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1991.

Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company, 1989.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T. & Holubec, E.J. *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book, 1986.

Keiman, H. Informal mediation by the scholar/practitioner. In: Bercovitch, J. & Rubin, J.Z. (Eds.) *Mediation in international relations*. New York: St. Martin's, 1992. Pp. 64-96.

Klare, M.T. War, conflict, and peace in the post-Cold War era. In: Klare, M.T. (Ed.) *Peace & world security studies: A curriculum guide*. (6th ed.) Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994. Pp. 43-54.

Lopez, G.A. Challenges to curriculum development in the post-Cold War era. In: Klare, M.T. (Ed.) *Peace & world security studies: A curriculum guide*. (6th ed.) Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994. Pp. 3-13.

Montville, J.V. *Conflict and peacemaking in multiethnic societies*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1991.

Reardon, B. Feminist concepts of peace and security. In: Smoker, P., Davies, R. & Munske, B. (Eds.) *A reader in peace studies*. New York: Pergamon, 1990. Pp. 136-148.

Richters, J.E. & Martinez, P. Children as victims of and witnesses to violence in a Washington, D.C. neighborhood. In: Leavitt, L.A. & Fox, N. (Eds.) *The psychological effects of war and violence on children*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1993. Pp. 253-276.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O.J., White, B.J., Hood, W.R. & Sherif, C.W. *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robbers Cave experiment*. Norman, OK: University Book Exchange, 1961.

Silverstein, B. Enemy images: The psychology of U.S. attitudes and cognitions regarding the Soviet Union. *American Psychologist*, 1989, *44*, 903-913.

Silverstein, B. The psychology of enemy images. In: Staub, S. & Green, P. (Eds.) *Psychology and social responsibility: Facing global challenges*. New York: New York University Press, 1992. Pp. 145-168.

Sward, R.L. *World military and social expenditures 1991*. Washington, DC: World Priorities, 1991.

Sivard, R.L. *World military and social expenditures 1993*. Washington, DC: World Priorities, 1993.

Staub, E. *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Tickner, J.A. Feminist perspectives on peace and world security in the post-Cold War era. In: Klare, M.T. (Ed.) *Peace & world security studies: A curriculum guide*. (6th ed.) Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994. Pp. 43-54.

Wahlstrom, R. Enemy image as a psychological antecedent of warfare. In: Ramirez, J. et al. (Eds.) *Essays on violence*. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1987. Pp. 21-45.

Wessells, M.G. Social-psychological determinants of nuclear proliferation: A dual-process analysis. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*. (In press.)

White, R.K. *Fearful warriors: A psychological profile of U.S.-Soviet relations*. New York: Free Press, 1984.

Williams, S. ...Learning peace by peace. *UNESCO Sources*, 1993, No. 49, 7-8.

Worchel, S. The role of cooperation in reducing intergroup conflict. In: Worchel, S. & Austin, W.G. (Eds.) *Psychology of intergroup relations*. (2nd ed.) Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1986. Pp. 288-304.

"Peace Education Miniprints" are published and distributed by the R&D Group "Preparedness for Peace" (address: School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden).

At present "Peace Education Miniprints" will also function as aids in the networking activities of PEC/IPRA (the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association).

ISSN 1101-6418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE